DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 754 CE 034 079

AUTHOR Long, Eugene S.
TITLE Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training at California Community Colleges: A Guide to Implementation and Resources.
INSTITUTION San Jose City Coll., Calif.
PUB DATE 1 Oct 82
NOTE 41p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Community Colleges; Educational Benefits; Educational Needs; Educational Objectives; English (Second Language); Guidelines; Models; Postsecondary Education; Program Descriptions; *Program Implementation; Resources; Services; *Teacher Education Programs; Two Year Colleges; *Vocational Education Teachers
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

This guide describes the implementation of vocational instructor training in California community colleges. Covered in a background section are the following topics: the federal program in bilingual vocational education, bilingual vocational instructor training, the goals and methods of bilingual vocational education, and bilingual vocational instructor training at San Jose City College and other California community colleges. Following a discussion of the need for such programs, their benefits to the community college are outlined. Examined in a section on program implementation are the instructional program, staffing, funding, and planning. Provided next are models for bilingual vocational instruction and for vocational English as a second language. Various program support services are described. Appended to the guide is a brief bibliography of pertinent resources. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221754

BILINGUAL VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTOR TRAINING AT CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES: A GUIDE TO IMPLEMENTATION AND RESOURCES

Submitted to Department of Occupational Education
San Jose City College
San Jose, California

October 1, 1982

Eugene S. Long, Ph.D.

CE 034079

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M Heeney

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	FOREWARD	1
I.	BACKGROUND	1
	The Federal Program in Bilingual Vocational Education	
	Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training	2
	The Goals and Methods of Bilingual Vocational Education	3
	The San Jose City College Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program	4
	Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training at California Community Colleges	6
II.	NEED	13
III.	BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE	17
IV.	IMPLEMENTATION	20
	Instructional Program	20
	Staffing	22
	Funding	23
	Planning	25
V.	MODELS OF INSTRUCTION	27
VI.	SUPPORT SERVICES	32
	APPENDIX: SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY	36

Foreward

The author of this guide has had experience as program coordinator, grants writer, and instructor in federally-funded bilingual vocational instructor training programs over the past four years. Most recently he was an instructor and consultant to the bilingual vocational instructor training program at San Jose City College which trained 50 Spanish-speaking participants to teach in bilingual vocational education programs. He wishes to acknowledge the generous assistance and support in writing this guide of Gene de la O, the project director and Josie Mendoza Negrete, the project counselor. Dr. Greg Ohanneson, Assistant Dean, Occupational Ed. at San Jose City College has also supported this guide project and made valuable suggestions.

The writer wishes also to state that where sources are not specifically mentioned in the guide, his personal experience with bilingual vocational instructor training programs forms the basis for the advice and recommendations contained herein.

I. BACKGROUND

The Federal Program in Bilingual Vocational Education

In response to the fact that millions of people -- many recent immigrants and refugees -- were being denied vocational training, and hence employment, because they did not understand English well enough to benefit from job training, the federal government began a program in the mid seventies of bilingual vocational training. Embodied in the Education Amendments of 1963 and 1976, the purpose of this program is to give access to vocational training for the limited English proficient unemployed and underemployed. With initial funding at 2.8 million dollars in 1976 and subsequent increases in yearly federal grants to over four million annually to mostly public adult vocational training sites and community-based job training projects, this program is relatively small by most standards: it has trained a few thousand limited English-speaking workers and a few hundred bilingual vocational teachers, counselors, and language instructors. Necessarily, then, the program has had a demonstration character from the beginning. Officials in Washington who began the program hope that the federal model of bilingual vocational training will spread and be adopted by public and private job training agencies around the country. It deserves wide recognition. The program, by any measure, has been an unqualified success. It has proven that concentrated, short-term training of a year or less in which vocational instruction is given in English and the native language together with English focused on job-related language is a cost effective way to integrate limited English-speaking people into the work force. Specifically, the federal program in bilingual vocational training points to these accomplishments:

(1) A national placement rate of 90% to 95%

(2) Cost effectiveness: the costs of training are returned to the government in less than three years in increases in income tax revenues and decreases in welfare and other forms of public assistance.

(3) Relatively high initial salaries of those placed in jobs.

(4) Low incidence of program completers who go on welfare.*

Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training

With the Education Amendments of 1978 legislation was added which strengthened the program in two respects: funding at 25% of total appropriations was earmarked for the training of bilingual vocational instructors and 10% was allocated to research. Yearly thereafter several universities and a few community-based projects and community colleges were engaged in the training of instructors and instructor aides to teach in bilingual vocational classrooms. By in large the bilingual vocational instructor training programs recruited participants from the teaching staffs of vocational training programs and from business and industry -- especially those with large limited English-speaking populations and from industry and business sites, principally in large urban areas in New York, Texas, California, and Florida. Bilingual ability in English and a minority language is a prerequisite, as it would not be feasible to teach a foreign language in one year for the mastery necessary to teach native speakers in the classroom. In addition to vocational teacher training and the history, theory, and methodology of the bilingual vocational teaching of adults, however, course work is included in English as a second language and the minority language. This is necessary as most bilinguals do not have equal facility in both languages. Many participants need special work in developing a technical and teaching vocabulary in their native language due to the fact that they received their vocational training in English in the

* Joan Cassidy, Program Officer, OBEMLA, address to National Conference of Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training, Washington, D.C., August 19, 1981.

U. S. On the other hand, bilinguals born and trained abroad may need to improve their English language skills sufficiently to feel comfortable speaking and writing English at the high professional level demanded of classroom teachers.

The Goals and Methods of Bilingual Vocational Education

What is bilingual vocational education? As it is still a relatively new idea in the long history of vocational training in the U. S., it is important to understand what bilingual vocational education is. Essentially, bilingual vocational education trains limited English-speaking people in a marketable skill, using the participants' native language, where necessary, to teach basic concepts, and concurrently teaches the trainee vocational English as a second language, focusing on the essential communication skills to get a job and function effectively at the work site. Under this system job seekers are not required first to have mastered English before they begin vocational training, the prevailing norm around the country which causes a high level of frustration and drop outs on the part of the would-be trainees and high levels of government financial assistance in the form of welfare, aid to dependent children, food stamps and the like. Bilingual vocational instruction, then, has two components:

(1) Vocational instruction taught bilingually in which the native language is used where necessary during the transition period when the trainee is mastering English.

(2) English language instruction not for general purposes but for a specific job, taught concurrently.

The goal in each case is to train limited English-speaking job seekers within the shortest time, to get them off public assistance and into at least entry level jobs as soon as possible. These time constraints -- the federal program specifies training in no more than one year -- have the effect of

making such programs more concentrated and efficient in terms of time, energy, and money. But with these requirements of bilingual instruction in skills training and job-related English in the English as a second language class, specially trained instructors are required: a vocational instructor who knows and can teach his/her skill in English and also the participants' native language and an ESL instructor who not only knows how to teach English as a second language but, additionally, can develop materials and teaching strategies specific to a particular occupation, be it electronics, data entry, janitorial service, medical assistance, carpentry, clerical skills, or any number of entry level occupations, each with its special vocabulary and way of communicating.

The San Jose City College Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program

In 1981 the San Jose Community College District received a grant of $198,990 from the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Bilingual and Minority Languages Affairs (P.L. 94-482) to operate a bilingual vocational instructor training program for 50 Spanish-speaking participants recruited from local business, industry, and vocational training sites. The goal of this project was "to provide a one year vocational teacher training course for Spanish-speaking persons presently employed in industry, enabling them to teach vocational skills to adults in English and Spanish." By so doing the program hoped "to meet the critical shortage of vocational instructors possessing both job knowledge and skills and the dual language capabilities necessary for instruction of the many unemployed and underemployed in the Santa Clara Valley who are Spanish speaking but so limited in their English proficiency that they could not benefit from regular vocational training offered in English."

The need for such a program in the San Jose area was documented in the

proposal sent to Washington. In a community college district with a 22% Spanish-speaking population and an unemployment rate twice that of the population at large, it seemed obvious that bilingual vocational training offered a solution. But before such training could be effectively implemented, bilingual instructors to teach in Spanish and English would have to be trained. Job placement of successful participants was a key feature of the program: a full-time counselor/job placement officer was specified in the plan. A unique approach to the teacher training component was the University of California Extension vocational instructor training course integrated into the course work offered at San Jose City College. It was felt that collaborating with this statewide program offered two distinct advantages:

(1) The benefits of a well established program recognized nationally for its comprehensive approach to training vocational teachers.

(2) A California vocational teaching credential in the particular field the participant was skilled in. This was necessary as the bulk of the teaching positions students might qualify for were with the 25 community colleges in the Bay Area, all of which required a credential.

Complying with the requirements of the federal program, students were also given course work in English or Spanish to improve their professional communications skills and a course in the philosophy, methods, and materials peculiar to bilingual vocational instruction.

Forty-nine participants, representing 19 different occupational skills, completed the program. In terms of job placement, even in the economically depressed situation of today's job market in the San Jose area, 17 instructors were placed, most in part-time positions, while 15 were upgraded in their present vocational teaching position at the end of the course. Job search and placement continues. By all accounts the program has been a success. The students, the outside evaluator, the faculty and administrators

all felt that the program had been worthwhile. The administration showed its support for the concept and viability of the idea of bilingual vocational instructor training by agreeing to continue the program in some form for the next academic year.

Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training at California Community Colleges

Now that San Jose Community College District has successfully operated a bilingual vocational instructor training program -- the first at a California community college -- it remains to evaluate this experience in the light of its potential for continuation and institutionalization of the program without government support. The need for such training is apparent. It remains, perhaps, to question and refine the federal program model and make it more responsive to California community college needs. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, it should be pointed out, has two pertinent goals which speak directly to the issue of bilingual vocational instructor training: goal 6, "Provide vigorous national leadership in occupational education and economic devlopment," and goal 8, "Promote and support the concept of access to postsecondary education."* The following are recommendations for adapting the federal model of bilingual vocational instructor training to the California community college system.

The programs which have operated under federal legislation (P.L. 94-482, Part 3, Subpart 3, Sec. 186) to train bilingual vocational instructors, while offering the community colleges a great opportunity, nevertheless do not entirely suit the needs of these colleges nor the limited English proficient populations the legislation was designed specifically to serve. The recommendations contained in this report seek to overcome four deficiencies in the federal program, those related to the issues of (1) training time,

*Community College Journal, May, 1982.

(2) teacher certification, (3) the language environment for which trainees are prepared, and (4) the integration of instructor training with direct bilingual vocational training.

1. Program duration. A fundamental difficulty with the federal legislation is embodied in the requirement that the bilingual vocational instructor training be limited to no more than one year. Standard teacher training programs normally last much longer: when the special requirements of bilinguality and vocational skills competence are added to the conventional teacher training syllabus, it is even more unlikely that an adequate bilingual vocational instructor training program can be provided in one year. Assuming the participant on entering the program had the competencies in English and the minority language deemed minimal (see Kirschner bilingual vocational instructor competencies), the future bilingual teacher would probably still be lacking in teaching skills and/or vocational skills that would demand more than a year's study to bring to an adequate competency level. And we must keep in mind that most people recruited into the federally sponsored bilingual vocational instructor training programs cannot devote full time to their studies and teacher preparation. There have not been adequate stipends for participants to give up jobs and work full-time on the program, which would be prohibitively expensive in any case. At best, then, it must be a part-time academic program crammed into one year.

Another time requirement related to the instructor training program is that of the one-year limit for the direct training of the limited English proficient trainees. This effectively eliminates a great many occupational training programs which very well might provide jobs and a more equitable match between industry/business needs and the trainees' capacity for training. It means, essentially, that the entire program is geared to entry level,

low skills, low-paying jobs, discriminatory in its effect on the minority trainees. It is ironic that such a program, begun with the intention of eliminating discriminatory practices in training and hiring actually fosters discrimination of another kind: while guaranteeing entry into job training programs to those previously kept out, it relegates these same people to the lower paying less prestigious jobs by limiting the training time to one year. This practice screens out LEPs from training for such relatively high paying jobs as secretary, medical records clerk, auto mechanic, electronics technician, draftsperson, and a host of other occupations which require a two-year preparation for certification -- or even adequate training -- to be hired. There is another pernicious aspect to limiting the training to one year, that of not providing the trainee with the means of reaching his/her educational and occupational potential. This ideal has always guided public education to a certain extent in the United States, and is certainly a basic premise of community college education in California. Not only are we limiting a person's occupational horizons by limiting the training time, but we are not taking advantage of all this person may be able to offer society and the business or industry for which he/she is trained. A one-year limit, then, is a waste of human resources; the LEP trained to be an Electronics Assembler when he/she could easily handle the more demanding -- and longer -- training for the job of Electronics Technician works an injustice upon the trainee as well as deprives industry of a more highly trained employee. The nurse's assistant who could have been trained as an L.V.N. or R.N., the typist who could have been trained as a legal secretary, the mechanic's helper who might have been trained as a certified diesel mechanic are all examples of the potential discriminatory effects of the federal Bilingual Vocational Training Program.

By extension, the bilingual vocational instructors who must train their LEP students in one year are, likewise, limited as to teaching occupation choice. They cannot train electronics technicians, legal secretaries, L.V.N.s, or diesel mechanics -- where they might very well have the competency to teach and hence an opportunity for a higher paying, more prestigious position.

California community college programs, fortunately, do not have to adhere to the time constraints of the federal bilingual vocational instructor training program. Community colleges have the capacity and flexibility to design vocational training programs to closely suit the actual needs of both society and the individual. The major determining factors as to developing both basic bilingual vocational training and bilingual vocational instructor training are the following:

(1) Realistic prospects for jobs once the training is completed.

(2) Capacity of the institution to offer the training.

(3) Potential of the participant to succeed in the program.

Offering a program of six months up to two full academic years, including certificate programs, makes a more effective bilingual vocational instructor training program as well as a direct bilingual vocational training program, which reflects actual needs. A less hurried program of teacher training will be a better program in most cases. The student evaluation completed at the end of training at the San Jose City College Vocational Instructor Training Program commented on two factors which can be corrected by this more flexible time schedule: reducing the class load, and modifying program completion to one or two years. (See San Jose City College Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program Final Report.)

Without the imperative of compressing all that must be learned into one academic year, more possibilities are opened up, more and better-paying jobs

await trainees at the end of training for both trainees and instructor trainees. A slower pace not only leaves more time to assimilate material, it allows participants to integrate their work experience with their academic training. It also allows a longer, more fully developed teaching practicum, a necessary feature of any teacher training program. In conclusion, the California community colleges have the capacity to improve on the federal model for bilingual vocational instructor training in respect to the training duration, and thus improve, potentially, the whole quality of the program.

2. Teacher certification. One issue not faced by the federal program in bilingual vocational instructor training is that of teacher certification. Some kind of certification to teach or serve as a teacher's aid is a requirement in the publically supported institutions where vocational training takes place, in virtually all states in the country. Certainly in California there are many possible credentials required of vocational teachers to teach in a community college as well as in the secondary schools, where there are also job opportunities. Here again, the community college and the California Department of Education are qualified to rectify this lack. For no matter how well trained as a bilingual vocational instructor, if the person does not have the appropriate credential or the requisite combination of academic preparation and work experience to qualify for a credential in his/her vocational area, the person is limited to teaching in private vocational schools or community-based training sites where salaries are invariably lower and job security usually more tenuous. In the major urban areas, however, courses through University of California Extension Vocational Instructor Training Program can be integrated into community college course work and field training. This program, in existence since 1969, has provided a rigorous and well developed program in teacher training that has served the State well. Phase I and

Phase II of this training are given on demand at sites throughout the state to suit local needs for credentialed vocational instructors. Costs are reasonable (currently about $185 for each phase, which carries six credits) and class schedules and hours are compatible with the hours and schedules of workers who have jobs and cannot devote full time to teacher training.

In addition, there are other courses in most community colleges which in various ways complement vocational teacher training. Courses for bilingual teaching aids, for example, or those concerned with materials development and audio-visual aids are also appropriate. The community college in many ways is a much more congenial environment to the training of vocational instructors than are the traditional four-year colleges with their panoply of teacher training courses and five-year credential programs, but very little contact with vocational training, often the backbone of many community college offerings.

3. The language environment for which participants are trained. The language environment for which participants are trained is English, according to the federal legislation. This is entirely understandable, as it focuses attention on where the majority of the jobs are. However, in certain areas of this country there are communities -- especially in New York, Florida, Texas, most importantly in California -- where there is a need for trained professionals and technicians who deal with a non-English-speaking public. In such areas an L.V.N., secretary, waiter, auto mechanic who speaks Spanish, Vietnamese, or Cantonese is a great asset to a service provider or business. And, even more important, there are jobs waiting for people trained bilingually in a particular occupation. Again, the California community colleges would not have to limit instructor training to teaching participants in two languages only as an interim, transitional stage, but can also accommodate those

who need fluency in both languages in order to train job seekers to deal with their LEPs in their native language. There is a need especially in the medical assistance field for trained instructors in certain areas of California impacted with Spanish-speaking and Asian refugees.

4. Integration of instructor training with vocational training. Another feature of the federal legislation on bilingual vocational instructor training concerns the integration of instructor training with vocational training programs. To be effective, instructor training should be integrated with vocational training taking place on the same site, so that future instructors have the benefit of working in a mutually supportive environment. Except in one noteworthy case, the federal program has not provided this learning/teaching environment. The community colleges, however, with their heavy emphasis on occupational education, offer the ideal environment in which to train occupational teachers, representing, again, an improvement over the federal model.

The field of Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training being relatively new, there are few resources to guide us in developing such programs. One of the nationally recognized experts in the field is Mary Galvan of Austin, Texas. As a consultant, she has guided the development of the federal program and been involved in virtually all aspects of research, implementation, and evaluation of Bilingual Vocational Training as well as Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training.* Closer to home, Norma Zoffman, a dean at Mission College, Santa Clara, and Jorge Guevara at De Anza Bilingual Center, Sunnyvale, as well as Rudy Cordova at San Jose City College are experienced in this field.

*Mary Galvan's address: 607 Spurlock Valley Drive, Austin, Texas, 78746. Telephone: (512) 327-2829.

II. NEED

The Limited English Proficient adult population in California is large and growing by all accounts. In 1976 some 25% of the population was of non-English language background, a total of 5.2 million people, of whom 4 million were adults over 18, and thus part of the work force. How can one characterize the nature of this fast-growing segment of the population? There are many ways, but looking at certain demographic tables we can make the following generalities about this predominantly limited English speaking group:

(1) They have a higher than average birth rate

(2) They have a higher than average incidence of unemployment and underemployment

(3) They have less schooling and a higher dropout rate than the average

(4) Spanish speaking and Asians account for a preponderant share of this population (statistics from Horizon).

We can also say that this limited English proficient population is concentrated in urban areas of the state. Counties most heavily impacted include Los Angeles, Orange, San Diego, Santa Clara, San Francisco, with the Spanish speaking predominating in all counties except San Francisco, where the Asians have a slight majority. California has over one-third of all the Spanish speaking in the U.S., according to data in the Horizon report. The growth of this population segment is also well documented in Horizon. From 1976 to 1980, for example, the Spanish speaking population increased by 33%, the Asians by 41% while the white-classified population increased only .7% in the state. Beyond high birth rates for the dominant LEP minorities in California Hispanic and Asian communities, another factor projects California's LEP increase in population even higher, immigration patterns. Immigration and Naturalization Service statistics show that over one-fourth of all

immigrants to the U.S. settle in California. (Horizon, p. 21) If undocumented immigration is added to the yearly immigration rate of over 800,000 admitted to the U.S. in 1980, immigration is now higher than at any other time in our history, including the period around the turn of the century, when immigration figures reached record highs. Add to these facts that California receives a preponderant number of immigrants and the problem of assimilation into the work force in this state takes on colossal proportions.

A solution to the problem of assimilation into the work force is, of course, the absorption of increasing numbers of workers in an expanding economy. The California economy, reputed to be the eighth largest in the world, is diverse and growing in most sectors (although an economic recession has at least temporarily halted growth in several important industries). Even so, there is a reasonable expectation that California business and industry can absorb these numbers of new workers. But this assumption does not account for the changing character of the California economy. California industry is converting to a much more technological base than previously was the case. A rapidly changing economy dominated by technology, electronics, data processing, computers, and robotics, needs relatively fewer entry level, unskilled workers and greater numbers of highly trained technicians and operators. Vocational training, then, is the overriding need.

To tap this work potential of the California adult LEP immigrant population, however, bilingual vocational education is needed. Bilingual vocational education, which seeks to train LEPs in marketable skills in the shortest possible time, while concurrently giving them essential job-related English is the most efficient and humane solution to integrating LEPs into the work force. It is also the least costly method. Bilingual vocational instruction, with its emphasis on skills technology training and English can, within a year

or two at most, train a LEP immigrant/refugee for a job, removing this person from the public assistance rolls, welfare, ADC, and other forms of public and private assistance where the unskilled and limited English proficient make up a disproportionate number. The federal bilingual vocational training program estimates that it takes less than four years for the government to recover the costs of training in its bilingual vocational training program.* This does not account for the program's benefits in strictly human, personal terms. For training a limited English proficient person under using the above precepts and methods usually contributes to the viability and health of a whole family -- and by extension society at large. An economically self-sufficient family has a far greater chance for happiness and success than one dependent on government aid.

Given, the bilingual vocational model as a solution to job training for LEPs, it remains to answer the question, who will teach the vocational skills to these adult immigrants and refugees? Bilingual instructors, those who know English and the native language of their student population in addition to being capable of teaching vocational skills, would be required. As such individuals are in very short supply, some kind of specialized training is called for. And, as it is generally a long process to train a person initially in a vocational skill sufficiently to the mastery level where he/she could teach others in the classroom, it is generally preferable to seek persons already trained in the vocational skills who have some bilingual abilities and give them training to teach their vocation in two languages. Such programs to train bilingual vocational instructors encompass several areas:

1. Teacher education. How to teach, to develop performance objectives; lesson plans, to determine the best way to present materials, use of

a variety of instructional strategies and media, evaluate the teaching/learning process.

2. Linguistic competencies in English and the minority language where both could be used by the instructor as mediums of instruction, and
3. Bilingual education and its applicability to teaching vocational skills to adults.

III. BENEFITS TO THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

The benefits to the community college which sponsors a bilingual vocational instructor training program are primarily two, one affecting the community college and the business/industry which it serves and the other the linguistic minority students it also serves. Such a program addresses the important goals of providing the linguistic minority students with not merely entry-level job training, but professional training as an instructor of the trade he/she practices. It also provides the business/industrial community with trained bilingual instructors who are able to tap the large reserves of limited English proficient people who need job training but lack sufficient English to get it outside of a bilingual vocational training program.

Let us look at these two effects of a bilingual vocational instructor training program more closely.

(1) With the huge influx of immigrants and the general increase in limited English proficient populations in California's most populous counties (Los Angeles, Orange, Santa Clara, San Diego, San Francisco), there is a pressing need for jobs. Until these people have jobs, they cannot be absorbed into their communities, or be economically self-sufficient. But the key to jobs is training and English language skills, best provided by a bilingual vocational training program with trained bilingual vocational instructors. The community college thus has the opportunity to advance the goals and opportunities of its minority students by this program.

(2) Secondly, by providing bilingual vocational instructor training, an equally important need is met by dealing with the business/industrial community's demand for trained workers, and by extension, the instructors to teach these workers the required skills. A bilingual vocational instructor training program can provide the personnel to allow the business/industrial

community to take advantage of a potentially large immigrant labor force that is in most cases eager to work and eager for training. Business and industry can still absorb large numbers of certain kinds of workers -- even in times of high unemployment -- provided they have the proper training. With instructors trained to impart skills in English and in the native language of the trainees, the possibility for meeting business/industry needs for these workers is greatly increased. The community college is virtually the only institution in the State which can adequately provide the training and related services to the limited English proficient immigrants and refugees in the kinds and quantities demanded. The California community colleges would again be playing a unique role in the State's educational system.

Additionally, by sponsoring a bilingual vocational instructor training program, community colleges are also preparing minority instructors who could teach in the community college system, a system whose faculty is underrepresented in minority faculty. San Jose Community College District, probably representing the normal hiring patterns among the hundred odd colleges around the state, it is reported, has only hired one full-time Spanish-speaking person in the last five years. This is a district whose population is 22% Spanish-speaking. Covert discriminatory policies may be at fault. The District is trying to correct this situation and has implemented a vigorous affirmative action plan. But there is also the possibility that at least part of the reason no Spanish-speaking persons were hired on the faculty is that position searches did not turn up many qualified candidates. A bilingual vocational instructor training program will go far toward remedying this situation.

There are, then, important benefits that accrue to the community colleges that sponsor bilingual vocational instructor training programs. Not

the least of these is an enhanced public image; by offering a special professional upgrade training program to limited English proficient minorities, the community colleges are able to deflect some of the negative feelings of these minorities about the hiring policies obtaining in many urban community colleges. The industrial/business community which often voices impatience with the numbers and quality of trained personnel which the community colleges yearly release to the job market, would likewise feel that the community colleges were responding positively to their urgent needs.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

Instructional Program

Course work in a Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program should include classes in the following areas:

1. Vocational teaching. Principles and methods.
2. Bilingual Vocational Instruction. Principles and methods of bilingual education as applied to the vocational training of limited English Proficient adults.
3. Materials development for bilingual vocational training. (There are virtually no suitable materials on the market to suit the special conditions of teaching bilingual vocational adult classes.)
4. Language instruction in English (especially writing and speaking skills) and the native language (especially identification and mastery of an adequate technical vocabulary peculiar to each vocational field) so that participants are competent to teach their vocational skills in both languages.
5. Teaching Practicum. A field teaching experience at the end of classroom training in which the participant has responsibility for all or segments of a vocational teaching assignment involving limited English proficient students, including planning, the presentation of instructional modules, and evaluation.

The California community colleges, especially those located in urban areas, are usually capable of providing these courses. With the exception of the course in vocational teacher preparation, the courses outlined above are already found in the college catalogue, or can be introduced with only slight modifications to the existing course offerings. Most urban colleges have courses for bilinguals, for the preparation of bilingual teaching aides, and

also courses in the languages, history, and cultures of the minority students which make up a large proportion of their student populations.

(1) Vocational teaching. In conjunction with the University of California Extension program in vocational instructor training, the task of training the participants to teach the vocational skills he/she uses on the job is accomplished over a period of two semesters. (See course outlines in appendix.)

(2) The class in bilingual vocational instruction may have to be added to the curriculum. However, many California community colleges already offer courses in Bilingual Education and Ethnic Studies which have course outlines covering some of what must be dealt with in this course. In the case of Bilingual Vocational Instructor training for Spanish speakers, Mexican American Studies, offered at many urban community colleges, is a convenient department to house a course in bilingual vocational instruction.

(3) Bilingual materials development is often given as part of a program to train bilingual classroom aides. It remains only to focus the materials development on the vocational training of adults.

(4) In regards to language training, most community colleges offer English as a second language courses to their LEP student population and some have even instituted courses in Vocational English as a second language, VESL, such as ESL for Machine Technology, ESL for business and Clerical skills, ESL for Electronics. If such courses are not offered, serious consideration should be given to instituting such courses, as, regardless of the requirements of a bilingual vocational instructor training program, there is an urgent need for such specialized courses for the large numbers of refugees and immigrants who come to the community college for vocational training. Such courses and their instructors are resources for the bilingual vocational instructor training program. As the participants in a bilingual vocational

instructor training program are already functional bilinguals, what is needed is a polishing of language skills in one or both of the participant's languages. In the case of English, trainees often need to improve their skills in written and verbal communications, writing and giving instructional presentations in English. Attention should also be given to sentence and paragraph structure, the use of various rhetorical devices, and grammar and punctuation. A course titled English Communications skills for Speakers of XX Language will serve the needs of these students.

Additionally, most bilingual participants, especially if raised in the U.S., will need some formal instruction in their native language. Bilingual students usually need to gain confidence in their use of the standard dialect, because they will be using this language as a medium of instruction. Secondly, language assessment will reveal that most candidates or participants in a bilingual vocational instructor training program lack the technical vocabulary necessary to teach in their chosen vocational field. This, again, needs to be addressed in language classes, where specialized vocabularies are developed and taught.

Staffing

Instituting a bilingual vocational instructor training program need not mean hiring new personnel. There may have to be a reallocation of teaching resources. As we have seen above, most of the courses required in the program are already in the catalogues and need only to be changed slightly to serve the needs of this program. As for administration and counselor activities, these functions can be assigned to present personnel. A dean who oversees the vocational education program can coordinate the program. A consultant or temporary coordinator may be needed in the beginning to start the recruitment of program participants, arrange for whatever special classes

are necessary and generally oversee the planning of this program. Counselor duties can be assigned to a credentialed counselor presently working at the college who is bilingual. This position is important and should occupy a full-time slot in the organizational table. Additionally, a part-time secretary may be needed to handle routine clerical and record-keeping duties.

Funding

As stated above, institutionalizing a bilingual vocational instructor training program at a California community college is largely a matter of reallocating resources. It is a matter of serving a priority need, the training of bilingual vocational instructors to handle the increasing numbers of LEP refugees and immigrants entering the community college system by shifting instructional hours, space, and facilities from less productive programs to this program. Forward-looking community colleges located in urban areas with high concentrations of LEP populations will see the need for bilingual vocational instructor training programs. They will assess the needs of their district populations and identify the problem of teaching recent immigrants the vocational skills they need to be integrated into the local economy. A program like the one outlined above would then not be seen as an enormous financial burden to the district. Nevertheless, expenses beyond the normal range of costs incurred in regular instructional programs will characterize a bilingual vocational instructor training program. A sample budget with proposed expenses from a minimum of $37,700 to a maximum of $80,250 are included in the appendix. These are not great sums, but may present insurmountable problems in times of financial crisis as we are now experiencing. What are the primary sources of funding for such a program?

An obvious source of funding may be local industry, rarely tapped for vocational funding, in spite of the fact that industry often is the primary

benefactor of vocational training programs. To site one example, the electronics industry, strong in both the northern Bay Area and in southern California in Los Angeles County is desperately in need of highly trained electronics personnel and would probably respond to funding appeals if a bilingual vocational instructor training program were geared to producing bilingual vocational instructors who could teach the math and electronics classes necessary to prepare technicians for this industry. As yet there are few guides to obtaining this kind of industry financial collaboration in vocational training and few precedents to refer to. The California Work-site Education and Training Act does seek to establish this kind of community college and industry partnership in vocational training, but it is too early to tell what ultimate effects this program will have in fostering these relationships -- which everyone agrees must be established. However, those who see the benefits of a bilingual vocational instructor training program are encouraged to strike out in this direction by writing a brief proposal and presenting it to industries which stand to benefit from this kind of vocational instructor training.

If this seems too risky or uncertain, Vocational Education Act funds administered by the State of California Department of Education offer some possibilities. The following two programs are especially relevant:

VEA, P.L. 94-482 Title II, Part A, Subpart 3. Vocational Education Program. Improvement and Supportive Services. Competitive bid and direct allocation, demonstration projects, ESL and vocational English as a second language, support services (assessment, placement, counseling) staff development, curriculum development, planning and coordination.

VEA, P.L. 94-482 Title II, Part A, Subpart 4. Vocational Education,

Special Needs. Demonstration, ESL/VESL, Basic Remedial, Support Services, Staff Development, Curriculum Development, Planning, Coordination.

Another funding possibility lies in a direct grant from the Chancellor's Office. Discretionary funds are allocated by the Chancellor's Office on a competitive basis to improve and expand services to minority students and in the area of bilingual education.

Planning

Establishing a bilingual vocational instructor training program at a community college depends on many factors, but none so crucial as adequate planning. Planning should begin at least six months in advance of beginning operations. Once an individual or group manifests as interest in such a program, a certain logical sequence of steps should be followed to implement the program. These steps are not necessarily peculiar to establishing a bilingual vocational instructor training project, but as that is the focus of this guide, they are outlined below, with a suggested starting time for the various activities. It is assumed for the sake of simplicity that the program would begin operations in the fall semester or quarter.

	Activity	Starting Time
1.	Proposal. Document need. Relate bilingual vocational training and instructor training to college, industry and community needs. Outline main features, goals, instructional program, selection criteria, budget, evaluation procedures, etc.	Feb. previous to fall start up.
2.	Support. Selling the concept to the college. Form a committee within the college to study feasibility. Committee composed of interested instructors, counselors, administrators. Enlist support of college president, dean of instruction, departmental chairs involved. Make presentation to Board of Trustees. Committee decides on scope of project, tentative budget, gets approval of president, superintendent, deans, etc.	March to May

	Activity	Starting Time
3.	Establish Advisory Committee made up of representatives of local business/industry, the bilingual community, leaders in the community interested in vocational training.	May
4.	Recruitment and Admission to the Program. Flier to mail to community organizations, industry and business sites where potential participants might be working.	June
	Develop application form	July
	Establish admission criteria: e.g., interest in teaching bilingual vocational training	July
	Form Selection Committee from faculty, administration and counselors; include bilingual and community representatives.	August
	Selection Committee makes final selections, includes an alternative list to cover people who will drop out in first weeks.	August 2nd week
5.	Begin Instructional program and support services	August-September
6.	Placement	April-June
7.	Program Evaluation and Planning for next cycle.	June

V. MODELS OF INSTRUCTION

Bilingual Vocational Instruction

What is bilingual vocational instruction? Having established, above, the need for bilingual vocational instruction, it is necessary to be clear about what bilingual vocational instruction is. Briefly, it is training for gainful employment at less than the bachelor degree level in which limited-English proficient participants are given some instruction in their native language, so as to decrease the training time.

By specifying the training as less than the four-year college degree we are eliminating the usual professional categories. These jobs usually require lengthy preparation and expense, and, in most cases educate participants for jobs which are more difficult to find, are more competitive and often require some form of licensing (public school teachers, architects, lawyers, engineers, nurses, etc.). By specifying less than a four-year training period, a great many more jobs, with appropriate training, become accessible to participants. Many programs at private and publically supported trade schools and California community colleges require training of from five months to two years (often with certificates). These programs, especially with some kind of bilingual remediation, can produce job-ready limited English proficient prople who have a reasonable chance of succeeding in the job market without a lengthy and costly education. A few of these job titles we are speaking about are the following: electronics assemblers, technicians, and testers; licensed vocational nurses, clerk-typists, draftspersons, carpenter's helpers, beauticians, plumbers, construction workers, welders, machinists. Especially in technical areas, so-called blue-collar occupations, which require specialized training, there are good job opportunities, even in time of recession and high unemployment.

To serve the limited English student training in these occupations the instructor should not only have a thorough command of his/her vocational discipline and have minimal training in teaching, but be able to teach in English and the dominant language of his/her limited English students. Bilingual vocational instruction requires a highly specialized skill. It requires, first, a person who is sensitive to the needs and the cultural differences of limited English students and the ability to inspire them and teach them a marketable vocation. The instructor in the bilingual vocational classes will probably start out teaching almost the entire lesson and giving demonstrations in the native language of the students. But he/she must use English as soon as possible, integrating English gradually into the work and insisting that the vocational students learn the essential vocabulary in English. For it is their ability to communicate in English that will undoubtedly influence whether or not they get a job. A highly trained technician who cannot communicate adequately in English on the job will quickly lose the job. The instructor, therefore, must encourage the LEP students to use English and practice is constantly. The native language should not become a crutch: the students in the program are there not only to learn a vocational skill, but to learn English.

If we examine the skills the bilingual vocational instructor must have, it becomes apparent that he/she must have special sensitivity to language problems of the students and know when to use the native language and when to insist on English. In general, basic concepts, principles of safety, the nature and requirements of the vocational field are best handled in the native language. The names of tools and processes, troubleshooting, responding to commands, asking questions about work, getting clarification, will have to be in English. The model of instruction in the bilingual vocational

class is transitional bilingual education, using the native language in selected situations, where it is necessary, while gradually changing to an all-English classroom. The transition to English must be emphasized, rather than the maintenance and cultivation of the native language.

Vocational English as a Second Language

An important aspect of bilingual vocational education is learning English. However, the standard English as a second language courses offered to limited English proficient vocational students do not serve the needs of vocational students. There are several reasons why the standard, even intensive, ESL program is not adequate for such students:

General purpose ESL

> Takes many semester hours to complete and is often the only course taken, postponing the vocational skills training needed causing discouragement and a high drop out rate.
>
> Focuses on learning a general, all-purpose variety of English, often concentrating on grammatical forms, pronunciation, rather than on the specific language needed for the job.

The solution to this problem is to teach what has become known as a variety of English for specific purposes, vocational ESL. In VESL the top priority is given to the language used on the job. The task becomes at once easier in some aspects and more difficult in others. Recognizing that in the interests of time it is impossible to equip the student to be able to function well in English in all situations, the instructor is able to limit the amount of English to be learned to just that concerned with getting and keeping a particular job. Further, depending on the job being trained for, certain linguistic skills can be emphasized and others virtually ignored. The task of teaching the trainee English is thus simplified. On the other hand, the task of identifying what kind of English is to be learned, how much, and with what degree of proficiency becomes an enormous problem in some cases.

Very little has yet been accomplished in developing adequate materials to suit each occupation and language group. And the task of recording job-site discourse, analyzing these communication acts, and developing classroom practice materials is still in the developmental stage. Some basic, tentative vocational ESL materials have been developed for a few of the common occupations. And there are linguists and language teaching specialists gathering linguistic and sociological data in various occupations, processing this information and suggesting strategies for teaching the communication skills necessary for particular jobs. But essentially, the VESL instructor must be involved in the dynamics of materials development from the beginning. He or she may have access to VESL materials developed elsewhere for the vocational skills being learned; however, these will be only an aid and can rarely form the core of the instructional materials. The reason for this is that each program is unique in that the instructor, text, vocational skill, equipment, language proficiency of students, job targets will vary from class to class and school to school. Each VESL class should be tailored to suit these variables. The VESL instructor should begin by attending the vocational skills classes of his/her students, digest all text, audio visual and handout materials used in the class, and in general, become as conversant in the field as time allows. This can be a burden, but a cooperative vocational instructor can help a great deal. The VESL instructor, in fact, will need to be in continuous dialogue with the bilingual vocational instructor. A team approach can be quite effective. Each member has something to inform the other about. The vocational instructor needs to know what kinds of information the VESL instructor must have about the vocational field and individual language learning problems of the students they share. He/she also needs to become aware of what the objectives of the VESL course are and, in

general become fairly sophisticated about linguistic and language learning matters. The VESL instructor needs to know as much as possible about the discipline the vocational instructor teaches, the theory, methods, tools, and procedures, tests that characterize the vocational field. The VESL instructor is then in the best position to help the students learn their vocational field.

The focus of this guide, the preparation of bilingual vocational instructors is advanced by understanding the roles of the bilingual vocational teacher as well as the VESL teacher who complements the skills instruction. The field of vocational English as a second language has developed its own methodology and teaching materials, sometimes at odds with those of general English. It is a rich and fruitful field for research today and has the possibility of revitalizing the whole field of teaching English to non-native speakers of the language. It is possible here only to suggest the scope of this field as it impinges on the preparation of the bilingual vocational instructor.

VI. SUPPORT SERVICES

In planning and implementing a bilingual vocational instructor training program, support services are extremely important. It has been demonstrated many times that without adequate counseling, both academic and personal, and job placement, the program will not be successful, no matter how dynamic the instructional services are. Counseling services, always important in the community college, are even more critical when dealing with the special population recruited into a bilingual vocational instructor training program. Several characteristics of this population make this so: we are dealing here with adults -- some middle-aged -- with people who are classified as minorities, and often with people who may never have thought of themselves before as teachers. They need encouragement and a great deal of personal attention. Often they are returning to a school setting after many years' absence and will feel insecure and intimidated by the regimen of attending classes, doing homework, and taking tests. Many will think of themselves as primarily vocational as opposed to academic in their orientation to jobs and careers. Our public school system early places individuals in one of two tracks, academic or vocational, and often vocational is a residual category for those deemed not capable of doing the supposedly rigorous work demanded in an academic program. So feelings of inferiority may have to be dealt with.

As participants in the bilingual vocational instructor training program are bilinguals, they may be insecure also in one language or the other. They may not feel comfortable talking English in class, or they may not have a large well developed vocabulary in the technical field they are preparing to teach in their native language. These deficiencies can be dealt with in the curriculum, by offering appropriate course work in English -- especially composition, professional and technical writing -- and in the native language,

especially courses focusing on technical vocabulary in language X. However, beyond these considerations of course offerings, participants in a bilingual vocational instructor training program may need to hear support for their native language, whether it is standard or not, and for whatever variety of English they speak or write. Participants need to cultivate a relativistic attitude about languages and dialects, be reminded that there are no inferior dialects, that their native language -- whatever it happens to be -- is a valid instrument of communication, and if this language is not the standard variety then a standard form of the language can be cultivated through practice if this standard variety is indeed required in their work.

Personal counseling must also be given time and attention. Being adults with family responsibilities and jobs, many participants will find it difficult to balance all the demands on their time and energies. Returning to the classroom will probably be a new strain on family life; spouses, friends, parents, children must be supportive. Participants need to be aware of potential problems within the family and at work. Good counseling can help instructor trainees to deal with them. In the case of jobs, the counselor may have to intervene with employers to plead the case of a participant who needs to be allowed to change a work schedule to accommodate a class or workshop that is part of the program. The employer may need convincing of the value of the bilingual vocational instructor training program and the increased potential of an employee who can teach his/her trade in two languages. An effective counselor can also be supportive of a trainee who does not have the enthusiastic backing of an unsympathetic boss. Class schedules and curriculum changes can be made to allow a slower pace in the program.

Academic counseling for participants will be necessary in some cases. Close monitoring of academic progress, especially in the beginning, will head

off frustrations and failure in academic work. By working closely with the instructors, the program counselor can determine why a particular student is not working up to capacity and offer remedies: typing assistance with reports and research papers; learning assistance tutoring in reading, or help with study habits and organizing and writing papers.

The program counselor has the major role in finding employment for the teacher trainee. Employment at the end of training is the payoff. The counselor must match demand for bilingual vocational instructors in the local secondary, community college and trade school market with the training, talent, and experience of program graduates. In some cases the counselor may need to function in an advocacy role, pointing out to deans, continuing education directors, trade school directors, program officers, etc., that they could expand their services to business/industry and the community, if certain classes were taught bilingually. In other words, the counselor often needs to sell the concept of bilingual vocational training before he/she can "sell" the trained instructor to teach the class.

Another function of the counselor is that of arranging the on-site teaching practicum, especially important if the trainee has had no previous experience teaching. This important part of the training process can be provided by community colleges, trade and secretarial schools, regional occupational centers, D.O.E.-funded training centers such as the Centers for Employment Training and training departments of businesses and industries. The counselor must first contact the appropriate persons at these sites, explain the program and goals of bilingual vocational instructor training and the specific objectives of the teaching practicum. After determining how a vocational teaching practicum at the site could benefit the training site and the student participant, the counselor develops the practicum objectives to suit

participant and training agency needs and designs a work schedule and evaluation process for each practicum participant.

Recruiting participants into the program is another area in which the counselor's skills are invaluable. By participating in the interview with potential trainees to be admitted into the program the counselor can contribute much to the process of identifying those who can benefit most from the training and have the greatest potential for success.

APPENDIX

SELECT BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brady, Mary Ella, and Peterson, Morris P. 1980. "A Study of Bilingual Vocational Instructor Competencies." Washington, D.C.: Kirschner Associates.

California Advisory Council on Vocational Education. 1981. Horizon: An Overview of Vocational Education and Employment Training Services for Limited-English Proficient Persons in California.

California Department of Education. 1979. "Report of Recommendations Concerning Educational Programs for the Non-English Speaking Adult Population."

Chinatown Resources Development Center. California VESL Resource Directory. 1981. San Francisco, California, CRDC.

Crandall, Jo Ann. 1979. Adult Vocational ESL. Language in Education: Theory and Practice, No. 22. Arlington, Va.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Development Associates, Inc. 1978. A Guide to Decision-Making for Bilingual Vocational Materials Development. Arlington, Va.

_____. 1978. "A Study of the State of Bilingual Materials Development and the Transition of Materials to the Classroom. A Final Report: LEA Survey" Vol. 3. Arlington, Va.

_____. 1979. "Monograph for Bilingual Vocational Training." Washington, D.C.

Galvan, Mary. 1977. "Planning the Language Component; Bilingual Vocational (Part J)" Mimeographed. Austin, Texas.

Galvan, Mary, et al. "Bilingual Vocational Education: A Model." Mimeographed. Austin, Texas.

InterAmerica Research Associates. 1981. Assessing Successful Strategies in Bilingual Vocational Training Programs. Rosslyn, Va.

Kirschner Associates, Inc. 1980. A Monograph for Bilingual Vocational Instructor Competencies. Washington, D.C.

_____. 1980. "Evaluation of the Status and Effects of Bilingual Vocational Training. Final Report." Washington, D.C.

Lopez-Valadez, Jeanne. 1979. Vocational Education for the Limited-English Speaking: A Handbook for Administrators. Arlington Heights, Ill., Bilingual Vocational Education Project.

MacDonald, Ross, et al. 1982. Improving Techniques in Teaching English for the Job. Rosslyn, Va.: InterAmerica Research Associates, Inc.

McGroarty, Mary. 1979 "Instructor Development for Bilingual Vocational Training." Mimeographed. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University.

_____. 1979. "The Federal Role in Vocational Training for Hispanics." Mimeographed. Palo Alto, Calif.: Stanford University.

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. 1981. Information Packet for Bilingual Vocational Programs. Rosslyn, Va.

Reyes, Richard. 1979. "Project Salud: Final Report." Cupertino, Calif.: De Anza College.

San Jose Community College District. 1982. "Bilingual Vocational Instructor Training Program: Final Report." San Jose, Calif.: San Jose City College.

Periodicals

CATESOL NEWS. California Association of Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages. (Catesol Membership, Melanie O'Hare, 750 Eddy Street, San Francisco, California, 94109)

English for Specific Purposes. Corvalis, Oregon: Oregon State University, English Language Institute. (c/o Karl Drobnic, editor)

Forum. National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education. Rosslyn, Va. (1555 Wilson Boulevard, Suite 600, Rosslyn, Va. 22209)

VocEd. Journal of the American Vocational Association. American Vocational Association, 2020 No. 14th Street, Arlington. Va 22201.